

Remarks

The above Amendments and these Remarks are in reply to the Final Office Action mailed December 26, 2007.

I. Summary of Examiner's Rejections

Prior to the Office Action mailed December 26, 2007, Claims 1-28 and 63-88 were pending in the Application. In the Final Office Action, Claims 1-16 and 63-82 were rejected under 35 USC § 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. Claims 1-16 and 63-82 were rejected under 35 USC § 112, second paragraph as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Claims 17-28 and 83-88 were rejected under 35 USC § 112, second paragraph as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

II. Summary of Applicants' Amendment

The present Response amends Claims 1, 9, 17, 23, 67, 75 and 83, leaving for the Examiner's present consideration Claims 1-28 and 63-88. Reconsideration of the Application, as amended, is respectfully requested. Applicants respectfully reserve the right to prosecute any originally presented or canceled claims in a continuing or future application.

III. Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph

In the Office Action mailed December 26, 2007, Claims 1-16 and 63-82 were rejected under 35 USC § 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. More specifically, it was proposed that the specification as filed did not discuss any "second user and second client device external to said network of the remote file source."

Applicant respectfully disagrees, however for purposes of expediting prosecution, the present Response amends Claims 1, 9, 17, 23, 67, 75 and 83 so as to more precisely follow the language used in the specification. For example, as amended Claim 1 defines that the second user and second client device are outside of the firewall in the network of the file source and access server. Support for this feature can be found in paragraphs [0025]-[0026], [0028], as well as other portions of the Specification. (e.g. *see* "access server may be located behind whatever

firewall protections the file sources may use.” (par. [0025]) “The client system 110 establishes a secure network connection... between itself and the access server through a firewall...” (par. [0026]) “stored outside the firewall and interact with the access server 125 through an HTTPS/SSL connection *like the client devices*.” (par. [0028], emphasis added)).

As illustrated in the cited paragraphs, the specification clearly describes that the access server and file sources are behind a network firewall. Further, the client device is outside of this network firewall and interacts with the access server through the firewall. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that the claims, as amended, are fully supported by the Specification and thus comply with the written description requirement of 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph. Reconsideration thereof is respectfully requested.

IV. Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph

Claims 1-16 and 63-82

In the Office Action mailed December 26, 2007, Claims 1-16 and 63-82 were rejected under 35 USC § 112, second paragraph as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. More specifically, it was proposed that it is not clear which user and device are considered “external to said network of the remote file source” as defined in claims 1, 9, 67, 75.

The present Response hereby amends Claims 1, 9, 17, 23, 67, 75 and 83 so as to more clearly define the embodiment therein. As amended, the claims comply with the requirements of 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph and reconsideration thereof is respectfully requested.

Claims 17-28 and 83-88

Claims 17-28 and 83-88 were rejected under 35 USC § 112, second paragraph as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. More specifically, as stated in the Office Action:

- Claim 17, lines 13, 14, it is not clear what applicant meant by “accepting a message including a file location from the remote client, wherein said message includes a file in said file location as an attachment”. Furthermore, it is not clear what lines 15-19 accomplish.

- Claim 23, it is not understood what lines 17-21 accomplish. It seems that the file is already accessible by the remote recipient without any hyperlink inserted in the message since the file has been attached to the message in lines 15, 16
- Claim 83, lines 8-15 it is not clear what is accomplished. Again, it seems that the file is already accessible by the remote recipient because it has been attached to the message in lines 8, 9.

The present Response hereby amends Claims 1, 9, 17, 23, 67, 75 and 83. As amended, Claim 17 more clearly defines that a message is accepted from a client. This message has a file as an attachment and this file is located on one of the remote file sources.

In response to Examiner's comments regarding Claim 23 and 83, (the file being already accessible by the remote recipient without any hyperlink inserted), Claims 23 and 83 have been amended to more clearly define this feature. As amended, Claim 23 defines that the access server generates a proxy which contains credentials for the first user. The access server can then log into the remote file source by using these credentials and this enables the second user to modify the original file which was attached to the message.

Thus, when the recipient of the email message accesses the hyperlink, the recipient is allowed to modify the original source file, on the remote file source, rather than merely modifying the attachment copy which was transmitted as is usually the case with typical email attachments. Because the access server has a proxy with the first user's credentials, it can use these credentials to log into the remote file source as the first user and allow the second user to modify the original file (e.g. see Specification par. [0029]-[0032]).

In light of the above amendments and remarks, Applicant respectfully submits that all of the claims of the present Application comply with the requirements of 35 U.S.C. § 112 and reconsideration thereof is respectfully requested.

V. Request for an Interview

Applicant respectfully submits that in light of the above remarks and amendments, the claims are now in condition for allowance. However, in the event that the next Office Action is not an allowance, Applicant respectfully requests an interview with the Examiner prior to issuance of the next Office Action to further expedite prosecution of the present Application.

VI. Conclusion

In view of the above amendments and remarks, it is respectfully submitted that all of the claims now pending in the subject patent application should be allowable, and a Notice of Allowance is respectfully requested. The Examiner is respectfully requested to telephone the undersigned if he can assist in any way in expediting issuance of a patent.

The Commissioner is authorized to charge any underpayment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 06-1325 for any matter in connection with this response, including any fee for extension of time, which may be required.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: March 19, 2008

By: /Justas Geringson/
Justas Geringson
Reg. No. 57,033

Customer No.: 23910
FLIESLER MEYER LLP
650 California Street, 14th Floor
San Francisco, California 94108
Telephone: (415) 362-3800
Fax: (415) 362-2928